They speak of their project as a "species" of ideal Combination of the European Fleet. This is not to do it justice. The scheme is unique and perfect in every particular, and has proceeded from the brains of its projectors, like MINERVA from the brain of JOVE, fully equipped for every possible emergency. As in the case of the first Naval Demonstration, Turkey ought to be invited to contribute a Squadron, and on this occasion her consent can hardly be doubted. The scruple of the SULTAN to demonstrate against himself, though doubtless foolish, was intelligible. But by the laws of the new scheme, by the conditions of the ideal Combination, the difficulty will be avoided. As each Squadron will take a different direction, to be agreed upon beforehand, it is only reasonable to suppose that each Power will be allowed some latitude in the selection of the waters in which it would like its own Squadron to appear. The SULTAN might decide to send his Fleet into British waters; and whilst Admiral SEYMOUR was anchored off the Piræus or Smyrna, HOBART PASHA would appear peacefully in Bantry Bay, and, by way of diversion, make a trip to the Coast of Donegal. This would, indeed, be an ideal Combination; and after it, no one would dare to deny the existence of the European Concert. Obviously, the number of minor ideal Combinations, all suggested and carried out under the ægis of the central idea, is not slight. Cruising in different directions, the German ironclads might visit Cherbourg, while the French Fleet exercised its moral influence in the neighbourhood of Wilhelmshaven. Austrian Admirals would find themselves at home in the Bay of Naples or the harbour of Ancona, and the Duilio and Vittorio Emmanuele would divide themselves with amiable impartiality between Tunis and Toulon, by reason of the two places being so conveniently within easy reach of each other. It is not till we examine this ideal Combination in detail that we apprehend its full beauty. But even if in some trifling particulars it were to break down, that would not suffice to vitiate a proposal in itself so admirable. What would be the armaments of this new separated combined Fleet would no doubt be arranged without any difficulty; for it would not require the heavy and costly instruments of slaughter hitherto in vogue. It would carry inaudible guns, and would move through imperceptible water. All its apparatus would be innocent and harmless; phantom captains would give shadowy orders to ideal sailors; but it might perhaps be arranged that once a year, say at Christmas time, all the severed Squadrons should meet in order to give a practical proof of the ideality of the European Squadron by eating plum pudding together, provided by the generosity of the British Government.

"Ireland," says Mr. BENCE JONES, in his excellent paper in the new number of *Macmillan*, "like all other countries, contains good and bad of all classes." This is an undeniable generality, but (as Mr. JONES would be the first to admit) the good and bad Irishman are neither of them precisely the equivalents of the good or bad Englishman of their class; and in proposing to ourselves to aid the good and discourage the bad, it is highly desirable that some margin for these essential differences should be allowed. We have all heard, till we are rather sick of him, of the Irishman as he appears in the songs of MOORE, the novels of LOVER, the plays of Mr. DION BOUCICAULT, and the essays of M. RENAN on the *Poésie de la Race Celtique*. Between this poetical being, who, as M. RENAN says, has such a thirst for "the Infinite," that, when he can reach it no other way, he seeks it through "*une liqueur forte qui s'appelle le whiskey*," and the vulgar and noisy braggart to whom is addressed in this country the notice "No Irish need apply," we usually compose in our minds a somewhat heteroclite ideal. We figure to ourselves the Irishman in his native land as deficient in the sterner qualities of prudence, steady industry, and unbending veracity; but, on the other hand, of a charming simplicity of character and winning disinterestedness and kindliness. He is, *par eminence*, that mythical personage who is "nobody's enemy but his own." It would be worth while for some historical critic to investigate whence is derived the deep-rooted superstition concerning "pastoral simplicity" which always causes the inhabitants of great cities to depict to themselves the dwellers in remote districts as simple minded and true hearted in proportion as they are removed from the centres of civilisation. Were this really the case, it would be a bad omen for the future of civilisation itself; but, in fact, it is a ridiculous mistake. *Nos bons Villageois*, all the world over, instead of being more simple, are astute, self-interested, and cunning (though in an ignorant fashion) to a degree which the sharpest townsman rarely rivals. The solitudes of pastoral and agricultural life are not by any means peopled with the sweet dreams of a THEOCRITUS or a FLORIAN, but with shrewd and wily schemings and devices concerning such things as wills and leases, bargains and jobs.

The Irish small farmer or labourer is, in this respect, probably no worse than the French *paysan*; but it is a great mistake to suppose that he is at all more simple, though he is far less frugal and self-denying, than either he, or his own nearer Welsh or Scottish Celtic cousins. He combines, in short, in a way which it is difficult for JOHN BULL to realise, the qualities of vulpine cunning and extreme imprudence. The old Irish proverb, "*Fíon a'n diú, uisge amarach*" (wine to-day, water to-morrow), is the very motto of his life, so far as is concerned the disposition to take the goods which the gods (or any other benefactors) provide for him on the spot, and without any narrow forethought for the next day—not to speak of the next year. Even to sow his field in proper time for a harvest not to be gathered for six months is an act of faith and provision which he is not always prepared to accomplish, much less to lay by anything for "the rainy day," unless—indeed, as his detractors have unkindly remarked, it be his haymaking. He is disqualified constitutionally from projecting his imagination sufficiently into the future to realise what he will need when that future becomes the present; so in a happy-go-lucky way he trusts, like Mr. MICAWBER, that "something will turn up" when the time comes, and set him straight without any painful preliminary self-denial on his own part. But all this improvidence and recklessness, which we familiarly recognise as the typical Irish character, is, as we have said, by no means incompatible with a degree of cunning, craftiness, and subtlety, which would enable him, at a trial, to beat the cautious and prudent English yeoman hollow. Thus the country suffers doubly—from the improvidence of that class which in France and elsewhere, is frugal and thrifty as the inhabitants of an ant-hill; and also from the endless, illimitable jobbery which goes forward and turns every honest English law and Institution—Poor Laws, Juries, Land Laws, plans of relief and charitable funds—into so many machines for defeating the ends of justice, and making jobs and peculations. Mr. BENCE JONES says truly that "the falsehood and scheming which prevail in Ireland are the causes of the chief part of the present difficulty." Another characteristic of the lower class Irishman which it is painful to recognise, but of which it urgently behoves us not to lose sight, is the facility wherewith his *bonhommie* and gushing kindliness may at any moment be transformed into a peculiarly dangerous, half-animal ferocity, having few parallels. The "weak hysterics of the Celt," of which Mr. TENNYSON speaks, pass not only from tears to laughter, but also on some rare and terrible occasions to the roar of the tiger springing on his prey. Excitement, wide-spread and highly wrought, is, of course, everywhere liable to bring forth this terrible element in human nature, as Paris has witnessed again and again; but no half-maniac *pétroleuse* is more to be feared than an Irishman whose habitual good humour suddenly drops from him, revealing passions of hate and cruelty which have hitherto lain dormant. The great massacres of the seventeenth century, the scenes of the Rebellion of 1798, and the assassinations, burnings of homes, cardings, cutting off of ears, and cruel mutilations of harmless cattle at the present moment, are indications of this deplorable obverse to the smiling image of Hibernia; but to understand the full portent of the metamorphosis, it is needful to see the faces, such as those humorous and homely ones which ERSKINE NICHOL places before us, transformed in an hour as if by demoniac possession.

The amiable and generous traits which go far to counterbalance the grievous faults of Irish character have, unfortunately, small opportunity to display themselves in the Irishman's own country; while his worst characteristics are constantly called forth. He would delight, like a Milesian Chief of old, to be hospitable and profuse; but he is too poor to offer his neighbours, even on the occasion of a wake or marriage-feast, better cheer than a little whiskey and tobacco. His Gascon nature would be gratified did he possess the slenderest foundation for boastfulness; but he can scarcely find a peg even for his lively imagination to use for self-exaltation. He would be loyal to King or Queen if they would only exhibit themselves to his gaze, and suffer him to shout "Hurrah!" as they drove by; but they studiously abstain from visiting him. He urgently craves variety of interests, and would brighten up into a different and far more rational being (as he does in England and America) were he to live among the free currents of industrial and commercial activity, and find sports, races, music, theatres accessible for his enjoyment. Instead of this, he dwells all his life long either, as Lord BEACONSFIELD said, by the "melancholy ocean," or among the still more melancholy bogs and desert hill sides, associating only with other peasants as dull as himself, in a mud hovel, absolutely sottish in its ugliness and hopelessness of ornament, and where neither active business nor lively pleasures are ever heard of. No man was less meant by Nature to be isolated, and bored, and poor; no man, consequently, is so much exposed to the temptations of drink and the deceptions of demagogues, suggesting to him methods and modes whereby he can become rich and important, not by industry or self-denial, but by turbulence and crime. These are points of Irish character which those who attempt to touch the terrible problem of Irish affairs should never leave out of sight. Our "sick man," like many another patient, is chronically the worse for every medicine which we exhibit, even if we chance to relieve some pressing symptom of his malady. And there is another matter that is hardly ever remembered. There is, we venture to affirm, not an acre in the island for which there would not be found, in the event of any such "settlement" of the Land Question as is now suggested, at least five or ten claimants ready to come forward. They would be rarely or ever the occupants. Some might dwell in the same parish, some at a distance; some might be rich and able to undertake lawsuits, others might be in workhouses; some would be of English descent; others would belong to old Irish clans, but each one, without exception, would be prepared to proclaim that he, and he alone, had a right to the portion of the soil claimed. His ancestor, three, or six, or a dozen generations ago, was, he would argue, unlawfully dispossessed thereof by a landlord, or mortgagee, or creditor, or by WILLIAM III., or by CROMWELL, or in ELIZABETH's time, or possibly in the days of STRONGBOW. He would assert that he is the heir, according to one or other of half-a-dozen systems of inheritance, primogeniture, or tanistry, or heaven knows what, to the acre which was to be "re-settled." In short, whoever dreams that any scheme which human ingenuity can devise, beginning by dissolving existing contracts and abolishing the rights of present proprietors, will settle the Irish Land Question so as to introduce a millennium of peace and fraternity among Irishmen, will do well to renounce the pleasing illusion. Such a "settlement" would inevitably suggest to ten thousand Irishmen the justice of asserting their claims to every estate in the country. If these claims were ignored, their resentment against the new proprietors—especially if belonging to their own class—would be more bitter than that which they now entertain against the lords of the soil.

All lovers of the Angle, to say nothing of oarsmen, will rejoice to know that there is at last some prospect of the organisation of a Society for the Preservation and Protection of the Rights of the Public to traffic up and down the Upper Thames—in other words, the Thames between Teddington and its source—and to fish from its banks and from boats or punts moored in its waters. These rights have of late years been seriously threatened, and in some instances actually invaded. First and foremost there has been the steam launch nuisance. These "peripatetic tea-kettles," as one aggrieved angler angrily terms them, have been driven up and down the River at a perfectly reckless rate of speed, injuring the banks, frightening the fish, and swamping the "petty traffickers" who have as clear a title to the broad highway of the stream as has the owner of the most costly screw steamer that may overwhelm them in its wash. Nor is this all. Forty years ago the right of fishing in the River was practically undisputed. In these days, however, the Thames is preserved with the most extreme jealousy. Owners of the bank where a small tributary runs into the adjacent fields, or where there is a weir or a mill tail, or even where a long stretch of private garden extends along the shore, claim the right not only to the occupation and use of the bank itself, but also to the fishery up to the very centre of the stream. The right of the public, we are told, is limited to that of fishing from the bank, wherever the bank itself is a public towpath or footpath; and this right, it is urged, extends no further than the centre of the River. Were this contention tenable it would clearly entitle the riparian owner to fence his own half of the River out with stakes, and so to impede the public right of navigation. If a river be navigable, as the Thames is, then at any part where boats have a right to come and go in the usual course of traffic, there is also a right of fishery, unless some special Statute or Charter has taken it away. At Colchester, for instance, the Colne is navigable from its mouth at Brightlingsea to some distance beyond Wivenhoe; but the right of fishing in the estuary has been from time immemorial confined to the Colchester freemen. There are many rivers where the right of navigation is open to the public, and the right of fishery preserved for the riparian or other owners. But this has never yet been the case with the Thames; and riparian owners who wish to appropriate not merely the bank of the River, but its very bed, to their own personal use, must make out a strong case indeed before they satisfy the Courts of Law as to the validity of their claim. Rights, however, even of the most valuable kind, can sometimes be irretrievably lost if they are allowed to fall into abeyance. And for this reason, if for none others, it is gratifying to learn that the final outcome of a public meeting recently held, and largely attended by well-known anglers and oarsmen, is likely, as we have said, to be the formation of a Thames Preservation and Protection Society, sufficiently provided with the sinews of war to enable it to watch the strictest legal rights, not of its own members only, but of the public at large.

From time immemorial, as one of the speakers at the meeting most aptly reminded his audience, Englishmen have enjoyed the undisputed right of travelling, of fishing, and of following whatever business they may have had to do on the River Thames without let or hindrance. Long before there was any made highway, the River itself was the one great highway of all. Indeed, since the history of the world first began its course, rivers have always been the predecessors of roads, and it has been upon their banks that the world's great cities have grown up. Hence has sprung the doctrine, almost universal, that a navigable river is "public" in every sense of the word. The Normans parcelled out such portion of the English land as they could get occupation of, but no subtlety of law known to their ablest councillors availed to turn the bed of the Thames into private property. On no point is the English Common Law more clear than on the rights of "free fishery." The subject is one upon which infinite learning has been expended, and practical certainty has been the result. Rivers are either navigable or not. The distinction in the case of small streams may be difficult of definition; but use and custom has usually determined the issue in each instance, and, so far as the Thames, from Cricklade to its mouth, is concerned, its navigability has never been called in issue. Now in all navigable rivers—unless the older jurists are strangely at fault—the bed of the river itself appertains to the Crown, and the right of fishing to the public at large. "But," we are told, "in a public river some Royal grant or prescription may entitle a private person and his heirs to the exclusive right of fishing therein"—a privilege called by BLACKSTONE a "free fishery." Grants of free fishery, however, were so generally unpopular and obnoxious that they were specially prohibited by Magna Charta. That famous document, it may be remembered, was signed "about a mile and a half from Old Windsor Lock, near the Middlesex Bank;" and in "Magna Charta Island" is still shown the very stone upon which it is alleged that JOHN himself signed, sealed, and delivered it. Be this as it may—and archæologists are welcome to a point which they have made their own—it is certain that there was no "free fishery" in the Thames when Magna Charta was signed, and that in virtue of Magna Charta itself no such privilege can have since been granted. The right of fishing in the River belongs inalienably to all her MAJESTY's subjects, save only in so far as it may be, for the common benefit of all, restrained by statutable limitations. There are rules as to the seasons and times within which fish may be taken in the Thames, and as to the "sizeability" of the quarry itself, which depend upon special Act of Parliament, and which all anglers willingly obey. But the right of any riparian proprietor to claim the River adjacent to his bank as his own, and to warn anglers off it, cannot be for a moment seriously maintained. Such a "free fishery" could only have been acquired by Royal Grant given—as one of the "flowers of the Royal Prerogative"—before the date of Magna Charta itself; and it need hardly be pointed out that there is not a single proprietor on the whole banks of the Thames who can trace his titles and privileges back to such a date.

None the less these rights have been asserted; and riparian owners have endeavoured to eat up the Thames itself in much the same fashion as Lords of the Manor have eaten up our old common land. It is affirmed that some of the landowners on the side of the River have set up a claim to the proprietorship of the by-streams, the back waters, and the weir tails; and whilst one has laid claim to a part of the Old Thames itself, just above Cliefden—a part not now used for navigation—another has laid claim to miles above Oxford, charging a toll for each day's angling. Another riparian owner, it is asserted, has laid down the rule that no boat has a right on the Upper Thames except for the purposes of navigation, and that for any time longer than is necessary for navigation the persons in the boat are subject to penalties. Neighbouring Justices, it is asserted, have convicted persons of the offence of fishing in the waters of the Thames claimed by their neighbours, and a widespread spirit of discontent on the subject is declared to be prevalent, not in London only, but along the whole Valley of the Thames. If this be indeed the case, we can very well trust the various Thames Angling Clubs to protect their interests. Thames Anglers are, as a rule, prosperous citizens, who can afford to gratify their love of the gentle sport without much regard for the balance of a few stray shillings. When lob-worms have to be fetched from Nottingham, where they are specially bred for piscatorial purposes, when the swim has to be regularly baited two or three days in advance, and a punt with attendant CHARONS has to be hired, and rooms have to be taken at the village inn, and a railway journey hazarded, with all its concomitant small expenditure, it is clear that the man who can devote a whole day to the capture of three or four barbel, and perhaps a dozen or so of perch and roach, must be, in his way, an enthusiast. Enthusiasts are always difficult people to deal with. And if the various Thames Angling Clubs choose to co-operate and to institute a steady legal warfare against the riparian proprietors who claim the fishing as their exclusive right, and, on the other hand, the launch owners, who have made, or soon will make, fishing impossible for anybody, there is little doubt that they will come off victors in the contest.

The National Rifle Association have, none too soon, promulgated a Scheme drawn up by the Council for the prevention of fraudulent practices at future Wimbledon Meetings. The mere publication of such a document, coupled with the letter lately written by the Council to Private RUNTZ, of the London Rifle Brigade—one of the principal exposers of the late "scand-l"—is a recognition of the fact that, although no person has been brought to justice, certain practices have prevailed at Wimbledon that never should have existed, but which, having been discovered, must be effectually stamped out. The Scheme itself promises well. It deals with most of the points which, since the revelations of July last, have exercised the minds of practical Riflemen; but it is in no sense put forward as a final arrangement. As it stands, it will undoubtedly cause a larger number of officers to be employed, and it may become a question whether it will not be necessary to ask Volunteers to undertake some of the duties indicated. The mere checking of the scores between the black board and the tickets will cause a large amount of work, to say nothing of the extra duty entailed upon somebody of marking the scores upon the board. That butt serjeants and markers should be told off independently everybody will agree, while the arrangement at present foreshadowed, of squadding competitors to "butts" instead of "targets" seems calculated to break down any fraudulent arrangement that might be devised. One of the most important features, however, appears to be the proposed check on the marking by an officer placed in a mantlet and watching a certain number of targets, at the same time being in direct telegraphic communication with the firing points. The duty of these officers, it is assumed, will be to watch not only the marking generally, but any particular target when called upon to do so from the firing point; to signal any hits that may have been overlooked by the markers, and to re-signal the value of disputed shots when challenged. The fact of not allowing a shot to be challenged has always been a sore point at Wimbledon, and this concession will undoubtedly be much valued. It will probably be combined with a small fine for an ineffectual protest against the signalling of a shot, but a rule that has worked so well in such large meetings as those of Middlesex is hardly likely to break down at Wimbledon. One apparently trivial matter, but which will probably cause much discussion, is that all colouring of sights with anything but plain black is to be discontinued, and therefore we shall see no more of those gorgeous rainbow-tinted back and fore sights in which some of our "cracks" have lately delighted. The foregoing are the mere outlines of the Scheme, which there is plenty of time to consider and amend between now and the next Wimbledon Meeting. It is, however, a step in the right direction, and whatever may be the exact details settled upon, it is on all hands agreed that if the National Rifle Association of England is to maintain the reputation which it has so long enjoyed, everything connected with the Annual Competition must be absolutely above suspicion.

An interesting case has been tried before the Higher Court of Tribunal of Paris, in which M. CONSTANS, the Minister of the Interior, was practically the Prosecutor, and Monsignor COTTON, Bishop of Valence, the Defendant. The Bishop was accused, in terms of Clause 222 of the Penal Code, of having outraged by word of mouth "the honour or high-mindedness" of the Minister of State; and for this offence, had the Court not acquitted him, he would have been liable to suffer from one month to two years of imprisonment. It appears that the Department of the Interior issued a Circular referring to the dismissal of certain Jesuit Professors from seminaries under Episcopal control, and that this Circular enraged Monsignor COTTON. He accordingly indulged himself in vituperative replies, the character of which may be fairly judged by the comment he made on the threat that if the original Circular were not obeyed the Government would withdraw their subvention from the Training Schools under his supervision. This menace he said he regarded as "an insult." It was, he alleged, an attempt to "bribe" him. "You might," he wrote, "offer us all the savings of the PRESIDENT of the REPUBLIC and his Ministers—all the money which you put into your own pockets and those of your creatures. I tell you once more that we are not to be bought. The hatred of GOD and the love of gold are closely connected. Let you and your friends gorge themselves with money. The worship of pelf is the characteristic of our Rulers." The defence of the Bishop was, that in writing this he had assumed he was writing privately, and that he had no idea he was expressing himself in an offensive manner. The Court did not seemingly accept the first plea, but, apparently, with a keen sense of humour, it held that the second was good. In effect, it decided that expressions which, coming from anybody with even feeble pretensions to be a gentleman, might be fairly considered coarse, were not to be regarded as offensive when used by an Ultramontane prelate. There is one feature of the case that ought not to be overlooked. Notwithstanding the attempts now being made in France to purge the Judicial Bench of independent Magistrates, there are still Judges, it seems, who are not afraid, even when the Government is Plaintiff in a suit, to decide in favour of the Defendant.

According to a telegram which we publish this morning from our Roman Correspondent, a terrible fog round Milan has caused a series of disasters that may frighten Londoners who have not forgotten the experiences of the last few days. Five labourers, it seems, on the Venice and Milan line, in trying to get out of the way of a goods train, were killed by an express train coming in an opposite direction. Their cries were heard, but they themselves were not seen. Near the same place a pointsman was killed a little while after in the same way, and another man, a traveller, also lost his life in a similar manner near Alexandria, on the same night. Italian Railway Officials, it may be, are not accustomed to drive trains in a fog as ours are, and hence it is possible that when they work in the mist they are apt to make all sorts of fatal blunders. Thus we must not assume that what has just happened in the North of Italy must necessarily happen in London when the City and the Suburban Railway lines are enveloped in a thick impenetrable veil of yellow vapour, the meshes of which are impregnated with choking sulphurous fumes. In fact, when a dense fog descends on London, it is safer, as a rule, to travel by rail than by any other mode of conveyance; and it has always been supposed to be a mystery why accidents in such circumstances happen so seldom. Those who fancy that detonating signals are an adequate substitute for lights, and who believe that it is to them that we owe an immunity from accidents, would be quickly undeceived by interrogating an experienced engine driver on the subject. The truth is, that when a fog settles on a Suburban Railway line it strikes a wholesome terror into the hearts of those who work the traffic. They are accordingly doubly careful, and sacrifice every consideration to safety. At the same time, it is hardly possible to hope for absolute immunity from danger when travelling by rail in foggy weather. Some day or other a terrible accident will happen, and then we shall begin seriously to consider whether, if London Fogs are not altogether preventable, something cannot be done to mitigate their horrors.

Modern life is so very apt to be dull that the ingenious personages who contrive to brighten it in any way are always sure, in these days, of receiving a liberal appreciation. The wits and the humourists, whether they work with pen or pencil—those honoured benefactors of their species who enable the melancholy British public to laugh and grow fat, have, of late, indeed, become almost the spoilt children of Society. Even a Statesman of Mr. GLADSTONE's gravity and earnestness of purpose has a kindly word for the caricaturists who make fun of him. As he reminded us the other day, political strife is apt of itself to engender such angry feelings that we are all glad when a humorous light is thrown upon it. In other words, when men can be got to laugh at one another they are not in a mood for breaking each others heads. The issue by the conductors of *Punch* of a series of collected sketches from the pens of some of the most brilliant members of its artistic staff reminds us that the work of these true artists possesses elements of enduring interest. Mr. TENNIEL's admirable drawings, in which the politics of the day are so skilfully "chaffed," have, in the collected form in which they have recently been presented to the public, a genuine historic value. But they are thoughtful rather than merely amusing; and the still more recent publication, in volume form, of sketches by Mr. DU MAURIER and Mr. CHARLES KEENE will interest an equally wide circle, who love to view every-day life from its funny side. Even "persons of culture" will perhaps, in so far as they are capable of understanding anything so vulgar as a joke, unbend in an unwonted smile when they find the mirror held up to the eccentricities of the school, the Chaperon of which is Mrs. CIMABUE BROWN, and whose prophets are those inimitable æsthetic-twins, Messrs. MAUDLE and POSTLETHWAITE. But for those who live in communion with natural folks, Mr. CHARLES KEENE's volume of sketches, felicitously styled "Our People," will be a constant source of delight. It is not too much to say that if the late Mr. LEECH has a successor, he is to be found in Mr. KEENE. Both artists have the same vivid sympathy with the every-day life around them, the same quick insight into its foibles, the same deft power of sketching its follies, and making most exquisite fooling out of its weaknesses, and even its meannesses. The laugh they raise leaves never a sting behind it; their satire, even when it encroaches on low comedy, is ever free from any taint of coarseness or any trace of bad taste. If proof were wanted of the great advance which "Our People" have made in good manners and good taste within the present century, it would be afforded by a comparison of a volume of GILRAY's sketches with that in which Mr. KEENE has now embalmed the more felicitous specimens of his work.

We have received a telegram from our Correspondent at Teheran, stating that a mistake occurred in the news sent from Urumiah, and that it is Persian regiments, not Russian, which are moving against the sons of the Sheik Abdullah.

Sir F. Roberts has accepted an invitation to dine with the Mayor of Liverpool on the 3d of next month.

DISPERSAL OF THE ALLIED FLEET.

(REUTER'S TELEGRAM.)
RAGUSA, DEC. 3.

The International Fleet disperses to-morrow. The British Squadron will proceed to Malta, the French to Toulon, the Russian to the Piræus, the Italian to Brindisi, and the German to Trieste.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
VIENNA, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The Naval Demonstration is at an end. The International Fleet will be dispersed to-morrow or the day after. Such are the facts confirmed to-day by the Austrian Foreign Office. The step was agreed to by all the Powers without exception.

Notwithstanding that the collective Maritime Intervention of the six Great Powers in favour of Montenegro is thus at an end, there are some diplomatic personages in this capital who are prepared to hear of one or two Powers agreeing to continue without interruption their common action in the East, although henceforth they will be unsupported by their recent allies. The vessels of the Powers in question, it is thought, may not impossibly be still kept together.

THE GREEK QUESTION.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)
ATHENS, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The leader of the Opposition, M. Tricoupis, proved yesterday, in the sitting of the Chamber, that before the Conference the Greek cause was practically lost, the Beaconsfield Government having had no serious intention to carry out the 13th Protocol of the Berlin Treaty; and the essential point, namely, the question of Janina, had been sacrificed even by the promoter of Greek interests at the Congress, M. Waddington himself. M. Tricoupis brought forward unanswerable arguments that Janina is *par excellence* a Greek city, that it is important in every respect that the city should belong to Greece, that this question constitutes the main portion of the dispute, that its transfer is indispensable to the proper settlement of the frontier, and that if Janina is excluded no other solution will be acceptable to Greece.

This declaration was especially provoked by the rumour that has been spread lately that certain Powers are about to suggest a solution of the differences between Turkey and Greece which will leave Janina to Turkey. The rumour has thrown the Greeks into a fever of excitement.

M. Tricoupis's speech, brilliant and energetic as it was, since it will compel the Government clearly to avow its intentions, will provoke a new series of recriminations, out of which the Government has not much chance of emerging victoriously. Among other Government projects is one for reforming the present land-tax system, which the majority of the House is almost sure to reject.

M. Tricoupis prophesies the fall of the Government in twenty days.

The Chargé d'Affaires representing Turkey at this Court, Melik Effendi, has left suddenly for Constantinople, having been recalled by his Government in consequence of a scandal in which he has been mixed up here in a gambling house.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)
CONSTANTINOPLE, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The leading Turkish paper, the *Vakit*, alleges that the outcome of the Ministerial Councils on the Greek Question will be a Note to the Powers, calling attention to the threatening attitude of the Hellenic Kingdom. But if the Porte know the facts as well as they ought to do, the Greek armaments need not really cause any alarm. The latest official figures from the War Office at Athens show that the strength of all arms was barely thirty-eight thousand. The date of this figure is less than a fortnight ago, when the Greek enthusiasts already imagined that there were seventy thousand men under arms.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
COPENHAGEN, FRIDAY.

Private information received here from Greece fully corroborates the information from Athens published by *The Standard*. I have the best reason to believe that the King, acting with his usual candour, and in the most perfect concord with the Cabinet and the wishes of the nation, has plainly informed the Ambassadors that if at the latest by the 1st of March the territory allotted to Greece by the Berlin Treaty be not handed over, Greece will pass the Rubicon, the state of the Exchequer and of the popular feeling making extreme measures an absolute necessity for the sake of the dynasty and the country.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
VIENNA, FRIDAY NIGHT.

Both the Greek and the Bulgarian Governments deny that they have been in communication with reference to the plan imputed to them of bringing about a simultaneous rising against the Turks. Here implicit faith is not placed in the denial. According to my information, there is, however, no doubt that the most active negotiations are at present going on among the Powers upon the Greek Question. From Lord Rosebery's sarcastic description of M. Barthélemy St. Hilaire it is concluded that the attempts of the English Radicals to draw France along with them have proved failures. It is, however, affirmed that Austro-Hungary, France, and Germany are now pursuing a common policy towards Turkey and Greece. As an eminent statesman remarked to me to-day, "The great aim of the three Powers in question is the maintenance of peace. Hence the attempts which have been made to reduce the hopes and the expectations of the Greeks within reasonable limits, and to induce them to be content with an instalment. Hence, too, on the other hand, the pressure which is being brought to bear on the Porte in order to move that Power to make the largest possible concessions."

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
ROME, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The *Diritto* officially denies the statement that France, England, Austria, and Germany have negotiated respecting the Greek Question. It is equally untrue that Greece is determined to fight, if the Fleet is not sent to Volo, Salonica, or Besica.

THE COST OF DULCIGNO.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
VIENNA, FRIDAY NIGHT.

Now that the Dulcigno difficulty is practically disposed of it would be curious to know what has been its cost to the Great Powers. It is calculated that the Naval Demonstration has caused them directly an expenditure greater than would have sufficed to purchase the entire interest of the Porte and Albanians in the territory under dispute, while the indirect loss to the commercial interests of Europe has doubtless exceeded the value of the ceded district many times over. Perhaps the friends of Greece may take the lesson to heart. A lump sum, representing, say, three or four years' purchase of the revenue derived from Epirus and Thessaly, would form an offer which the Porte in its bankrupt condition could not long resist. It is very unlikely that a war between Greece and Turkey would absorb less money than would induce the Porte peaceably to give up possession of those provinces.

(REUTER'S TELEGRAMS.)
CONSTANTINOPLE, DEC. 2.

The Turkish Government has invited the Foreign Delegates, if possible, to commence the delimitation of the new Turco-Montenegrin frontier forthwith. The Delegates have unanimously replied acquiescing in this recommendation, inasmuch as perfect tranquillity now prevails among the inhabitants of the ceded districts.

RAGUSA, DEC. 3.

Dervish Pacha has addressed a Circular to the foreign Consuls at Scutari announcing the settlement of the Dulcigno question, and the restoration of order in the ceded district.

THE CZAR.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)
ST. PETERSBURG, FRIDAY.

The Emperor arrived here this morning, accompanied by Count Melikoff. After stopping, as usual, at the Kasan Cathedral for a few minutes his Majesty drove, in a close carriage, to the Winter Palace.

TURKISH AFFAIRS.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)
CONSTANTINOPLE, FRIDAY.

It is absolutely certain that Mr. Goschen will not accept the duties of permanent Ambassador to the Porte.

Negotiations continue with respect to the movements of the Fleet.

The Commission appointed to report on the sanity of Veli Mahomed, feeling unequal to the task, have suggested a consultation of experts; hence there may be a further delay in answering the Ambassador's Note.

(REUTER'S TELEGRAM.)
CONSTANTINOPLE, DEC. 3.

A Commission has been appointed, consisting of Seid, Mahmoud Nedim, Assym, and Osman Pachas, to deliberate upon the adoption of energetic measures against the Kurds.

THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT AND THE CHURCH.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
PARIS, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The Higher Correctional Tribunal of Paris to-day witnessed a novel sight. A French Prelate, Monsignor Cotton, Bishop of Valence, was placed in the dock on the charge of insulting the Government. In July, M. Constans, Minister of the Interior and Public Worship, sent a circular to the Bishops enjoining them to dismiss all Jesuits employed as professors in the clerical training schools, designated as *séminaires*, which are placed under episcopal superintendence. The Bishop of Valence replied by a letter which gave offence to the Minister, and though it was not made public at the time, and has not been published since, M. Constans decided to prosecute the Bishop, on the ground that insults against the Government, even though not made public, come under Clause 222 of the Penal Code, which runs thus:—

"When one or more Magistrates of the Administrative order or the Judicial order shall, in the discharge of their duties, or on the occasion thereof, have sustained some outrage by word of mouth tending to affect their honour or their high-mindedness, the person guilty of that offence shall be punished with imprisonment from one month to two years."

It is hardly to be supposed that when that Clause was framed it was ever intended that it should be applied to a Bishop for writing a letter to a Minister, especially as there was no publication; but this circumstance only renders the case more significant. Under a law of 1810, the Bishop was tried by the Court of Correctional Appeal, another illustration of the boasted principle of equality. The Bishop wore the undress costume of the Members of the French Episcopacy, and was attended by three Counsel, M. Béranger, a Senator, M. de la Bouillane, and M. Robinet de Cléry. In answer to the President, the Defendant stated that his name was Alexander George Cotton, that he was fifty-five years old, and that his profession was that of a Bishop at Valence. The following conversation ensued:—

The President.—Monseigneur, you have read the charge against you in the summons which you received; have you any explanations to offer?

The Bishop.—I wish, in the first place, to point out that I never had any intention of giving offence to the Minister or the Secretary of State. I may possibly have used somewhat strong expressions; but to insult the Minister or any one else never entered my thoughts. The letter which I am reproached with was addressed to M. Fallières, Under Secretary of State, and it was not intended to be communicated to M. Constans, the Minister of the Interior. I had been receiving from the Ministry letters marked "private" or "confidential;" they related to matters connected with the *seminaires*. I have also received a letter which appeared to be couched in very extraordinary language, which infringed, and indeed entirely ignored, canonical rights. It was quite evident to me that the matter must end badly; but after all, when I wrote to M. Fallières, I did not suppose my letter would be laid before his chief, M. Constans.

The President.—I would call your attention to the fact that several letters had passed between you and M. Fallières, and that contrary to what you have just been saying, you must have very well known that you were in communication with the Minister, as well as with his Under Secretary of State, and you must surely have seen that they had an official character.

The Bishop.—These letters were marked "private and confidential," and I did not publish them, or my answers, in the newspapers.

The President.—You can understand, Monseigneur, that if such letters were sent to the newspapers there would be an end to all administration.

The Procureur Général, M. Senator Dauphin, then rose for the prosecution. He wished to express himself with the deference due to a dignitary of the Church, but he had an imperative duty to discharge, and he would carry it out unflinchingly. That duty was to make it plain that the Government must be respected, and that those entrusted with the work of the Government and the administration of the law could not be insulted with impunity. That was a fundamental principle, and those who were tempted to ignore or disregard it must be compelled to respect it. The Right Reverend Defendant alleged that his letters were private and confidential, that they were not published, and that they were not intended to be read by the Minister himself. He was sorry to say that this plea was disingenuous. The Defendant must have known that a correspondence on such a subject must come under the notice of the Secretary of State. He also knew that it was not necessary that an offensive letter should be addressed to the person whom it was calculated to offend to come within the operation of the law; it was sufficient that the person offended should see the letter. The correspondence between the Bishop and the Under Secretary of State Fallières commenced on the 6th of August, and closed on the 14th October by the letter which led to this prosecution. The Procureur Général went through this correspondence *seriatim*. M. Fallières had written to the Bishop in October that if the Jesuit Professors were not turned out of the seminaries the Government would withdraw its subvention to those establishments. The Bishop replied in one letter, "*Pecunia tua tecum pereat*. We are not to be bought or bribed." Thereupon the Under Secretary called upon him to furnish a list of his professors, and to this the Bishop replied:—"I know of no law that warrants your asking such questions. You are neither my confessor nor my confidant, and I have no confidence in you. If I were to ask you if you were a Freemason or an Internationalist you would tell me that that was no business of mine. You have used liberty as a stepping-stone to power; there is no liberty, civil and religious, that you do not oppress. Is not that the height of cynicism and bad faith? You have three times threatened to suppress the subvention; pray do not repeat that menace—I regard it as an insult. You might offer us all the savings of the President of the Republic and his Ministers—all the money which you put into your own pockets and those of your creatures; I tell you once more we are not to be bought. The hatred of God and the love of gold are closely connected. Let you and your friends gorge themselves with money; the worship of pelf is the characteristic of our rulers." The Procureur Général earnestly urged the Court to sentence the Bishop not to imprisonment, but to a fine, however small, as that judgment would have a great moral effect.

M. Robinet de Cléry made a powerful speech, in the course of which he quoted Fénélon's letter to Louis XIV., and made a point by remarking that it was odd that under the Republic M. Constans should exact greater respect from the Episcopacy than the Grand Monarque.

The Court acquitted the Bishop of Valence, on the ground that in writing the letters he had no offensive intentions, and dismissed the suit without costs.

THE DANUBIAN COMMISSION.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
VIENNA, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The Porte has withdrawn its protest against the admission of a Bulgarian Representative to the Danubian Commission, but without prejudice to her rights in other cases. The Commission is accordingly shortly expected to assemble. It is very uncertain whether a satisfactory agreement can be come to, and an adjournment is very probable.

RUSSIA AND THE POWERS.

(REUTER'S TELEGRAM.)
ST. PETERSBURG, DEC. 3.

The *Agence Russe* to-day publishes a declaration, to which considerable importance is attached in political circles. Replying to the criticisms of the Russian Press respecting the attitude of Austria, France, and Germany, the semi-official organ says:—

"All the Powers are equally desirous of peace, and it is natural enough that there should exist some differences of opinion as to the best means of assuring it in view of the state of public feeling in the East. Russia has shared and still shares the views of England, but places above her own preferences the maintenance of the European Concert, which is the sole guarantee of peace. She will therefore declare herself in favour of the course most conducive to that result."

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF FRANCE.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
PARIS, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The question *The Standard* asks in its leader to-day, "Are we have another Naval Demonstration?" is one to which an answer is anxiously expected here. The Government says no, but M. Gambetta says yes. In to-day's *Débats* M. John Lemoinne rebukes his countrymen for an ignoble love of peace at any price, which he reminds them they did not entertain when he and some of his readers were younger than they are now, namely, when Louis Philippe was King, and when M. Lemoinne will forgive me for calling to his recollection, the pacific policy at any price of M. Guizot had no warmer admirer than the journal of which he was then an ornament, as he is now. M. Lemoinne says:—

"For the old stagers in politics and polemics, for those who witnessed the ardent and often violent contests which were formerly fought out in the Chambers on foreign affairs, the spectacle offered us to-day was a strange change of scene. Oh! reminiscences of the evacuation of Ancona, the United States Indemnity, the Pritchard affair, and others, what has become of you? Do you recollect that superb master of his art, M. Berryer, whose eloquence had at the same time the vivid brightness and rapidity of lightning, and behind whom the President (old Dupin), while pretending to call him to order, whispered, 'Go on, Berryer!' Do you remember the greatest of our classic orators, whose name was Guizot? Do you remember his sepulchrally pale face and his attitude like a lioness at bay facing her furious adversaries? Ah, in those days maledictions were hurled against the cowardice of the Government, against the system of peace at any price. Ministers were then impeached for not having set fire to the four corners of Europe! The King, Louis Philippe, had loved peace too truly, and he died of it. Now when we are present at the sittings of the Chambers we rub our eyes and inquire if really we are in the same country, in the same hall. Good old M. Bescherelle must feel quite as astonished as we do. Oh, the warmth and ardour of yore, whither have you fled? To-day Ministers are near being impeached, and why? For having approached too near the fire, and for having risked burning their fingers. They are accused of high treason, and why? For having sent a few ironclads to make a Platonic demonstration in front of a little fort only recently discovered by geographers; and yet orders were issued prohibiting a single shot being fired. Yes, this is true, but after all, to use an old adage, the cannons might have gone off all alone. They should not have been exposed to such a temptation. And this is what we have come to! Certainly we are staunch partisans of peace, there is no need to say so, but we are of opinion that it is not necessary to proclaim it so loudly. The French character seems to us somewhat to resemble the circus rider who can never succeed in placing himself in the saddle, and who no sooner jumps up on one side than he falls over on the other. Alas, on hearing the Minister of Foreign Affairs, alluding to the Congress, pronounce the words 'We went to Berlin,' we could not banish from our mind those sinister cries of '*A Berlin!*' which led us to Sedan. But to-day we sin by a contrary excess. We no longer cry either '*A Berlin*,' or '*A Pekin*.' Oh, no! we cry '*A la Marmite! A la Soupe!*' They want to make France, the France of History, sit for the portrait of Lucretia watching over the fireside and spinning wool. Well, truly, if this cold fit continues much longer we shall end by making ourselves ridiculous, and shall become the laughing-stock of the whole universe. Yes, we desire peace; that is quite understood. No, we will have no more adventurous enterprises; that is equally well understood. But we must not use and abuse our declarations of peace any more than our declarations of war. Wisdom must not degenerate into platitudes. Let us take care not to exchange the character of Don Quixote on his lank steed for that of Sancho Panza on his ass; and after having been perhaps too much like kings errant in politics, we must avoid becoming nothing but grocers and shopkeepers."

THE JEWISH PERSECUTION.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
BERLIN, FRIDAY NIGHT.

Another Jewish debate to-day excited the Prussian Lower House. Herr von Ludwig, an eccentric member of the Absolutist Party, moved for a full list to be made up of all those who had a hand in establishing Joint-Stock Companies in 1871 and 1872. Most of these, he contended, were Jews and swindlers.

Privy Councillor Herr Furth opposed the motion in the name of the Government. There was no need, he said, for classifying financial *entrepreneurs* according to their religion.

Herr Rickert, the Liberal leader, took the trouble to combat the assertion of Herr von Ludwig that all Joint-Stock Companies are swindles.

Professor Virchow protested against the Absolutists mingling ethnological principles with their political theories. Very many of the supposed Germans present, he said, were Slavs by descent; yet their rantings had begun to turn students' heads and influence the ignorant, who were always but too delighted to discover some specious reason for self-exaltation.

Herr Stöcker, the Chaplain, offered to mention privately the names of those who had signed the Mommsen Declaration and yet had dabbled in Joint-Stock Companies.

Herr Struve retorted that he despised all Pharisees and calumniators, and that he thought it a cowardly act on the part of the Rev. Herr Stöcker vaguely to accuse gentlemen in public and then offer to mention their names in private. Here Herr Struve was interrupted by a tremendous tumult. The outcries heard while it lasted threw but too glaring a light upon the passions roused by the meek Chaplain and his politic friends. At last Herr Struve was able to go on, and he said that the members of the oldest nobility had been specially mixed up with bubble concerns, and that he thought it his duty to repel the invectives uttered by their defenders. Upon this fresh outcries and recriminations ensued.

Herr Virchow then stated that Herr Stöcker, with reference to a previous utterance of his, had been asked by a Member, before the sitting, to mention the names in question privately, and that he had declined to do so. The like calumnies, he added, were being daily circulated by the leading paper of the gentlemen interested in supporting the so-called financial reforms that formed the characteristic stigma of the present sensational period. The proprietor of that paper was a member of the Party and a member of the House.

Herr Stöcker said he had promised to mention the names though he had not yet actually done so.

Herr von Ludwig then withdrew his motion, when the subject was allowed to drop.

A PARALLEL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—I have been reading with much interest Lord Granville's Despatches to Mr. Goschen.

In one dated "Foreign Office, Oct. 2," I find the following words:—"Your Excellency is aware from the reports which have been received that the state of the country in North-East Albania is little short of anarchy. The Turkish officials are powerless to execute justice; murder, violence, and forced exactions are prevalent, and the peaceable population is at the mercy of the armed Committees who, under the name of the Albanian League, have been allowed to assume absolute authority."

If a Turkish Statesman were to write as follows:—"Your Excellency is aware from the reports which have been received that the state of Ireland is little short of anarchy. The English officials are powerless to execute justice; murder, violence, and forced exactions are prevalent, and the peaceable population is at the mercy of the armed Committees who, under the name of the Land League, have been allowed to assume absolute authority," would he not very accurately describe the present state of affairs in a great part of Ireland?

I am Sir, your obedient servant,
AN IRISH PEER.

December 2.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—Some of your readers may probably recollect the contrivance to which the murderers of King Edward II. resorted in order to prevent any external marks of violence on his body betraying the secret of his death. Well, Sir, this infernal contrivance has been lately resorted to, as I heard last night on the best authority, by some Irish peasant or peasants in order to destroy a cow without betraying that it had been done by human hands. The strangeness of a fine cow's dying without any apparent disease led to its being opened, on which the contrivance was detected, the only difference being that a stake armed with rusty nails had been substituted for the red hot iron.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
* * *.

December 2.

EVENTS IN FRANCE.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
PARIS, FRIDAY, MIDNIGHT.

The crisis in the silk trade of Lyons continues. Yesterday a deputation of operatives waited on the Prefect to solicit his aid in the formation of national workshops. That functionary replied that he had no funds at his disposal for such a purpose, but that he would support the idea before the Municipal Council. It appears from the latest statistics that the exports from Lyons to America during November represented a total of only 2,344,654 francs, being nearly one million less than in October, and more than two millions less than in September. The decrease is most remarkable in silk stuffs and velvets, the exports of which have fallen from 2,500,000 francs to 1,400,000 francs.

A meeting of the promoters of the Exhibition of Electricity, to be held in Paris next year, took place to-day at the offices of the Ministry of Posts and Telegraphs. M. Cochery presided. In the course of the proceedings, which were chiefly formal, M. Berger, the Head Commissioner of the Exhibition, stated that the voluntary subscriptions already exceeded the 500,000f. demanded by the State as a guarantee fund.

The Comte de Chambord has subscribed a thousand francs to the fund for the relief of the dispersed Religious Orders.

The Paris Town Council continues its anti-religious crusade. Yesterday it adopted a motion, the object of which is to demolish the Church of the Sacred Heart now being built on the heights of Montmartre, and to devote the site to some work of "national utility." The Prefect of the Seine approved of the motion, reserving, however, the question of the indemnity to be given to the owners of the religious edifice. It remains with the Chamber to confirm or annul the motion, but in the present mania for religious persecution it is likely to be sanctioned.

An artilleryman belonging to the 12th Regiment blew out his brains last night in a restaurant on the Boulevard St. Martin, after having dined there. A letter, addressed to the War Minister, was found in his pocket, in which he said he preferred death to serving five years in the army.

The law papers to-day report an extraordinary case of child abduction. Five years ago a young woman gave birth to a daughter at the house of a midwife in the Rue Montmartre. A few weeks after the father was informed that the child had died. The burial took place in due course, and nothing more was thought of the matter till the other day, when, owing to some private quarrel, a cousin of the young woman disclosed the fact that a dead child had been substituted for the living one, which was sold to a wealthy but childless couple for three hundred thousand francs, the money being divided between the midwife and the mother. The young woman, who has since been living in a villa at Auteuil on the proceeds of the sale, has been arrested, and the police are said to be on the track of her accomplice.

The *Gaulois* has received a communication upon M. Jules Simon's manuscript work upon the 16th May, which he has not yet published. This journal says that, without being too indiscreet, it can affirm that if M. Jules Simon keeps his manuscript under lock and key, and hides it from all inquisitive eyes, even from his most intimate friends, the ex-Prime Minister in this only gives proof of more patience and kindheartedness than are usually possessed by Party men. Among the numerous anecdotes extracted from M. Jules Simon's book, the following is one of the most piquant:—

"It was a little before the 16th May, and a Cabinet Council was to be held at the Elysée. Before the sitting the Marshal took M. Jules Simon aside, and said 'Do you know that M. Gambetta has caused me to be informed of his desire to be presented to me? In a few words, this is what has happened. M. Duclerc came to me unofficially to tell me that on a certain day and hour M. Gambetta would be walking in a certain alley of the Bois de Boulogne, that he would be glad if I would arrive in my carriage, get out, and meet him as if by chance. It appears Gambetta fears that his influence with certain individuals of his Party would be compromised if he came to the Elysée. The proposition seemed to me rather laughable. Upon my word, why did he not at once ask me to put on a false nose?' 'Like Emile Ollivier at Compiègne,' put in M. Jules Simon. 'And what answer did you give, Monsieur le Maréchal?' 'Why, I refused, parbleu! However, I rather regret that I cannot find myself face to face with the man. Certain sides of his character please me. Gambetta is for war with Germany, and so am I.'"

A new ballet—*La Korrigane*—the libretto by M. Coppée, the music by M. Widor, has been brought out at the Opera last night, and proved a great success. The subject is well adapted for a ballet. It is a kind of Tam o' Shanter story; Korrigans in Brittany, as in Cornwall, are wicked fairies, who dance to death any rash mortal that intrudes upon their mystic evolutions. There is a love story introduced as a matter of course, and the lovers are ultimately made happy. The music is extremely pretty; the dancing of Mdlle. Mauri is the best thing we have had here since Cerito.

NEWS FROM ROME.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
ROME, FRIDAY NIGHT.

A terrible fog around Milan has caused a series of lamentable disasters. Five labourers on the Venice-Milan line were, while escaping from a goods train which they had heard but not seen, killed by an equally unseen express running in a contrary direction. Shortly afterwards a pointsman was killed at no great distance from the scene of the former accident, and the same night a poor traveller was similarly killed near Alexandria.

A strict inquiry into the causes of the fire at Naples is being made. Nothing is yet known with certainty, but the appearances are very ugly. The general opinion in Naples points to the crime of arson.

THE EARTHQUAKES AT AGRAM.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
VIENNA, FRIDAY NIGHT.

Shocks of earthquake still continue to be felt at Agram, but they are fortunately comparatively slight, and harmless.

The shocks are accompanied as if by the roll of distant artillery. This subterranean thunder is very powerful, and is heard up in the mountains of Agram.

The want and distress of the population continue undiminished.

No fewer than six hundred Agram families have taken refuge in the city of Laibach, the capital of Carinthia. The inhabitants of the latter place have rendered the poor Croats what help they could; but they complain that this sudden accession to their population has sent up house rents, and for the time considerably raised the price of the most necessary articles of food.

GERMANY.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)
BERLIN, FRIDAY NIGHT.

Baron Friesen, late Saxon Minister of Foreign Affairs, in a letter to the *Dresden Journal* protests against the vacillation imputed to him by an inspired print as characterising his conduct in the critical period of July, 1870. All the statements to the contrary put forward by the *Grenzboten*, Herr von Friesen says, are so many deliberate inventions and falsifications of the truth, which perhaps had been better avoided in the interest of the anonymous author. That is a nice supplement to the perfectly harrowing incidents of the last few weeks. Why the inspired attack was made is unknown, but may be guessed from the failure of recent designs.

The Löwe Magazine Rifle assumes an importance of political magnitude. Great as it was at the time, the progress made by the adoption of the needle gun appears small in comparison to the results obtained by the new invention. The extreme rapidity of the fire, which at first was supposed to constitute the one merit of the apparatus, in a new series of experiments has been discovered to form only one, and this not the greatest, of the advantages gained. To the astonishment of experts, the apparatus very considerably steadies the aim and increases the capacities of the soldier's arm. At a distance of six hundred mètres a column target fired at by a company ranged in two files, the other day, showed the marks of ninety-nine per cent. of the bullets discharged. Thirty-six figure targets ranged in a broken line at a distance of four hundred mètres were hit by eighty-five per cent. of the bullets fired. It is true the experiments were carried on by a crack rifle company; but as the above results were secured during the quickest of quick fire, the terrible effect of the new arm in battle may be easily imagined.

THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT AND THE CHURCH.

(By Telegraph.)
(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

PARIS, Friday Night.

The Higher Correctional Tribunal of Paris to-day witnessed a novel sight. A French Prelate, Monsignor Cotton, Bishop of Valence, was placed in the dock on the charge of insulting the Government. In July, M. Constans, Minister of the Interior and Public Worship, sent a circular to the Bishops enjoining them to dismiss all Jesuits employed as professors in the clerical training schools, designated as *seminaires*, which are placed under episcopal superintendence. The Bishop of Valence replied by a letter which gave offence to the Minister, and though it was not made public at the time, and has not been published since, M. Constans decided to prosecute the Bishop, on the ground that insults against the Government, even though not made public, come under Clause 222 of the Penal Code, which runs thus :—

"When one or more Magistrates of the Administrative order or the Judicial order shall, in the discharge of their duties, or on the occasion thereof, have sustained some outrage by word of mouth tending to affect their honour or their high-mindedness, the person guilty of that offence shall be punished with imprisonment from one month to two years."

It is hardly to be supposed that when that Clause was framed it was ever intended that it should be applied to a Bishop for writing a letter to a Minister, especially as there was no publication ; but this circumstance only renders the case more significant. Under a law of 1810, the Bishop was tried by the Court of Correctional Appeal, another illustration of the boasted principle of equality. The Bishop wore the undress costume of the Members of the French Episcopacy, and was attended by three Counsel, M. Béranger, a Senator, M. de la Bouillane, and M. Robinet de Cléry. In answer to the President, the Defendant stated that his name was Alexander George Cotton, that he was fifty-five years old, and that his profession was that of a Bishop at Valence. The following conversation ensued :—

The President.—Monseigneur, you have read the charge against you in the summons which you received ; have you any explanations to offer?

The Bishop.—I wish, in the first place, to point out that I never had any intention of giving offence to the Minister or the Secretary of State. I may possibly have used somewhat strong expressions ; but to insult the Minister or any one else never entered my thoughts. The letter which I am reproached with was addressed to M. Fallières, Under Secretary of State, and it was not intended to be communicated to M. Constans, the Minister of the Interior. I had been receiving from the Ministry letters marked "private" or "confidential ;" they related to matters connected with the *seminaires* I have also received a letter which appeared to be couched in very extraordinary language, which infringed, and indeed entirely ignored, canonical rights. It was quite evident to me that the matter must end badly ; but after all, when I wrote to M. Fallières, I did not suppose my letter would be laid before his chief, M. Constans.

The President.—I would call your attention to the fact that several letters had passed between you and M. Fallières, and that contrary to what you have just been saying, you must have very well known that you were in communication with the Minister, as well as with his Under Secretary of State, and you must surely have seen that they had an official character.

The Bishop.—These letters were marked "private and confidential," and I did not publish them, or my answers, in the newspapers.

The President.—You can understand, Monseigneur, that if such letters were sent to the newspapers there would be an end to all administration.

The Procureur Général, M. Senator Dauphin, then rose for the prosecution. He wished to express himself with the deference due to a dignitary of the Church, but he had an imperative duty to discharge, and he would carry it out unflinchingly. That duty was to make it plain that the Government must be respected, and that those entrusted with the work of the Government and the administration of the law could not be insulted with impunity. That was a fundamental principle, and those who were tempted to ignore or disregard it must be compelled to respect it. The Right Reverend Defendant alleged that his letters were private and confidential, that they were not published, and that they were not intended to be read by the Minister himself. He was sorry to say that this plea was disingenuous. The Defendant must have known that a correspondence on such a subject must come under the notice of the Secretary of State. He also knew that it was not necessary that an offensive letter should be addressed to the person whom it was calculated to offend to come within the operation of the law ; it was sufficient that the person offended should see the letter. The correspondence between the Bishop and the Under Secretary of State Fallières commenced on the 6th of August, and closed on the 14th October by the letter which led to this prosecution. The Procureur Général went through this correspondence *seriatim*. M. Fallières had written to the Bishop in October that if the Jesuit Professors were not turned out of the seminaries the Government would withdraw its subvention to those establishments. The Bishop replied in one letter, "*Pecunia tua tecum pereat*. We are not to be bought or bribed." Thereupon the Under Secretary called upon him to furnish a list of his professors, and to this the Bishop replied :—"I know of no law that warrants your asking such questions. You are neither my confessor nor my confidant, and I have no confidence in you. If I were to ask you if you were a Freemason or an Internationalist you would tell me that that was no business of mine. You have used liberty as a stepping-stone to power ; there is no liberty, civil and religious, that you do not oppress. Is not that the height of cynicism and bad faith? You have three times threatened to suppress the subvention ; pray do not repeat that menace—I regard it as an insult. You might offer us all the savings of the President of the Republic and his Ministers—all the money which you put into your own pockets and those of your creatures ; I tell you once more we are not to be bought. The hatred of God and the love of gold are closely connected. Let you and your friends gorge themselves with money ; the worship of self is the characteristic of our rulers." The Procureur Général earnestly urged the Court to sentence the Bishop not to imprisonment, but to a fine, however small, as that judgment would have a great moral effect.

M. Robinet de Cléry made a powerful speech, in the course of which he quoted Fénélon's letter to Louis XIV., and made a point by remarking that it was odd that under the Republic M. Constans should exact greater respect from the Episcopacy than the Grand Monarque.

The Court acquitted the Bishop of Valence, on the ground that in writing the letters he had no offensive intentions, and dismissed the suit without costs.

It is hardly to be supposed that when that Clause was framed it was ever intended that it should be applied to a Bishop for writing a letter to a Minister, especially as there was no publication ; but this circumstance only renders the case more significant. Under a law of 1810, the Bishop was tried by the Court of Correctional Appeal, another illustration of the boasted principle of equality. The Bishop wore the undress costume of the Members of the French Episcopacy, and was attended by three Counsel, M. Béranger, a Senator, M. de la Bouillane, and M. Robinet de Cléry. In answer to the President, the Defendant stated that his name was Alexander George Cotton, that he was fifty-five years old, and that his profession was that of a Bishop at Valence. The following conversation ensued :—